

51. Defendant impliedly represented to the public, Plaintiff, the Class and others that its pet food products were safe for consumption by their pets and could be safely purchased.

52. In fact, Defendant recalled or caused to be recalled millions of containers or pouches of pet food because it risked the health and well-being of consumers, customers, Plaintiff, purchasers, the Class, and others.

53. Defendant violated Tenn. Code Ann. §47-18-104 (a) and sub-parts of (b) by placing these unsafe pet food products in the stream of commerce in Tennessee.

54. Each Plaintiff, Class member, and other person adversely affected in Tennessee has suffered an ascertainable loss of money or property due to a violation of the Consumer Protection Act.

55. Plaintiffs brings a claim for a violation of the Tennessee Consumer Protection Act under Tenn. Code Ann. §47-18-109, including the ascertainable loss of money or property by each such person.

#### **X. Rule 23**

56. Plaintiffs ask this Court to certify the following Class:

All persons in the United States who purchased or fed his, her, or their cat(s) or dog(s) pet food produced or manufactured by Defendant that was or will be recalled by the Defendant, including that produced from December 3, 2006 up to and including March 6, 2007.

57. Plaintiff is a member of the Class, sues as a representative party on behalf of all, and avers that the class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.

58. There are questions of law or fact common to the Class. These common questions include but are not limited to the following:

- a. Whether Defendant sold pet food products that were recalled or subject to a recall?
- b. Whether Defendant advertised, represented, or held itself out as producing or manufacturing a pet food product that was safe for pets of the class members?
- c. Whether Defendant expressly warranted these products?
- d. Whether Defendant impliedly warranted these products for fitness for a particular purpose?
- e. Whether Defendant impliedly warranted these products for merchantability?
- f. Whether Defendant purported to disclaim any express warranty?
- g. Whether Defendant purported to disclaim any implied warranty?
- h. Whether any limitation on warranty fails to meet its essential purpose?
- i. Whether Defendant intended that the pet food products be purchased by Plaintiff, Class members, or others?
- j. Whether Defendant intended or foresaw that Plaintiff, class members, or others would feed their pet food products to their pets?
- k. Whether Defendant recalled the pet food products?
- l. Whether Defendant was negligent in manufacturing or processing the pet food products?
- m. Whether using the products as intended – to feed their pets – resulted in loss, injury, damage, or damages to the Class?
- n. Whether Defendant's negligence proximately caused loss or injury to damages?
- o. Whether Class members suffered direct losses or damages?
- p. Whether Class members suffered indirect losses or damages?

q. Whether Defendants' acts or practices violated state Deceptive Trade Practices Acts?

59. The claims or defenses of the representative parties are typical of the claims or defenses of the Class.

60. The representative parties will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class.

61. Prosecuting separate actions by individual members of the Class would create a risk of either –

a. Inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the class which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for defendants, the parties who oppose the class, or

b. Questions of law or fact common to the members of the class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, and a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.

c. Few, if any, Class members have an interest in individually controlling the prosecution of separate actions;

d. Plaintiff is unaware of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by members of the class;

e. It is desirable to concentrate the litigation of the claims in this forum;

f. No unusual difficulties are likely to be encountered in the management of a class action.

62. The undersigned Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class request that the Court appoint them to serve as class counsel first on an interim basis and then on a permanent basis.

63. They will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class, have identified or investigated the Class's potential claims, are experienced in handling class actions, other complex litigation, and consumer claims of the type asserted in the action, know the applicable law, will commit sufficient resources to represent the class, and are best able to represent the Class.

64. Plaintiff requests this Court to certify this Class in accordance with Rule 23 and the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005.

#### **XII. Jury Demand**

65. The Class demands a jury trial on all issues triable by a jury.

#### **XIII. Prayer for Relief**

Wherefore, premises considered, Plaintiff prays that the Court grant the following relief:

1. That process issue and Defendant be served. (Plaintiff's counsel will first provide Defendant's agent, Corporation Trust Company, 820 Bear Tavern Road, West Trenton, NJ 08628 with a Notice of Lawsuit by mail pursuant to the Federal Rules)
2. That as soon as practical, the Court certify a Class, defined herein, or modified as appropriate under the facts and law.
3. That the Court find that Plaintiff has satisfied Rule 23's and federal law's requirements for certifying a Class.

4. That the Court find that Defendant manufactured or processed the pet food products that were sold or offered to sale to Plaintiff and the Class.
5. That the Court find that Defendant intended Plaintiff and Class members to believe that the pet foods sold were fit and safe for consumption by their pets.
6. That a trial be held and Defendants be held liable to the Class for – breach of warranty, negligence, and under state statutes prohibiting deceptive trade practices.
7. That the Class be awarded an amount sufficient for direct damages occasioned by Defendants' acts and practices.
8. That the Class be awarded an amount sufficient for indirect, consequential, and incidental damages occasioned by Defendant's acts and practices.
9. That the Class be awarded treble damages or special damages authorized by state statutes prohibiting deceptive trade practices, depending upon the State where the Class Member lives.
10. That the Court award reasonable attorney's fees and costs and expenses recoverable under law.
11. That the Court order such other, further relief as the case requires and justice demands.

Dated: March 19, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ A. James Andrews  
A. James Andrews, BPR # 15772  
905 Locust Street  
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902  
(865) 660-3993  
Fax: (865) 523-4623

/s/Perry A. Craft  
Perry A. Craft, BPR # 6057  
Craft & Sheppard, PLC  
The Shiloh Building  
214 Centerview Drive  
Suite 233  
Brentwood, Tennessee 37027  
(615) 309-1707  
(615) 309-1717 (fax)

/s/Nichole Bass  
Nicole Bass, BPR # 021383  
905 Locust Street  
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902  
(865) 310-6804

Cost Bond

We are sureties for costs not to exceed \$1,000.

/s/ A. James Andrews

K



**TRUJILLO RODRIGUEZ & RICHARDS, LLC**

Donna Siegel Moffa, Esquire  
Lisa J. Rodriguez, Esquire  
8 Kings Highway West  
Haddonfield, NJ 08033  
TEL: (856)795-9002  
FAX: (856)795-9887

**BERGER & MONTAGUE, P.C.**

Sherrie R. Savett, Esquire  
Michael T. Fantini, Esquire  
Russell D. Paul, Esquire  
1622 Locust Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(215) 875-3000

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class

---

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

Jared Workman, and Mark and Mona Cohen,  
on behalf of themselves and all others  
similarly situated,

Civil Action No. \_\_\_\_\_

Plaintiffs,

vs.

Menu Foods Limited, Menu Foods Inc., and  
Menu Foods Midwest Corporation

**COMPLAINT - CLASS ACTION  
JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

Defendants,

---

**PLAINTIFFS' CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

Plaintiffs Jared Workman, and Mark and Mona Cohen, by their attorneys, allege upon  
information and belief, the following:

1. This class action is brought, and these proceedings instituted, to redress the harms  
resulting from the manufacture, production, and sale by Menu Foods Limited, Menu Foods Inc.  
and Menu Foods Midwest Corporation of dog and cat food marketed under over 90 brand names.

Plaintiffs make the following allegations, except as to the allegations specifically pertaining to Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' counsel, based upon the investigation undertaken by Plaintiffs' counsel, which included, inter alia, review and analysis of Defendant's website, press releases, news articles, and pleadings filed in other suits.

#### **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

2. Defendants manufacture and sell over 90 brands of pet food for cats and dogs, including popular labels like Iams and Eukanuba and private label brands sold at large retail chains. On March 16, 2007, the parent company of Menu Foods Limited issued a press release announcing the recall of 60 million cans of contaminated dog and cat food manufactured between December 3, 2006 and March 6, 2007. The recall covers the "cuts and gravy" style pet foods in cans and pouches manufactured at two of Menu Foods Limited's U.S. manufacturing facilities - Menu Foods, Inc. and Menu Foods Midwest Corporation, located in New Jersey and Kansas, respectively.

3. The recalled pet food that Plaintiffs and Class members purchased and fed to their pets caused their pets to become ill through kidney disease, requiring veterinarians visits, medications, hospitalizations and, in some cases, burials of those pets that died due to renal failure caused by the contaminated pet food. Many pets that consumed the recalled tainted food now require ongoing monitoring of their health to ascertain the extent of the damage to their kidneys.

4. Plaintiffs here seek damages, injunctive relief, attorneys' fees, and costs against Defendants.

## PARTIES

5. Plaintiff Jared Workman resides at 1150 Unit D, Monroe Drive, Boulder, CO, 80303. Plaintiff Workman purchased and fed his cat Iams pet food that was manufactured by Defendants during the Class Period. This cat, named Seth, became ill with kidney disease, was hospitalized, and subsequently died of acute renal failure. In addition to the cost of purchasing the contaminated food, Plaintiff Workman incurred economic costs in connection with the medical treatment and burial of his cat, as well as continuous medical monitoring of his other two cats.

6. Plaintiffs Mark and Mona Cohen reside at 1415 Brighton Street, Philadelphia, PA 19111. Plaintiffs purchased and fed their dog Iams pet food that was manufactured by Defendants during the Class Period. This dog, named Cookie, subsequently developed symptoms of acute renal failure. In addition to the cost of purchasing the contaminated food, the Cohens incurred economic costs in connection with the medical treatment and damage to personal property caused by their dog's illness.

7. Defendant Menu Foods Limited is a Canadian corporation located at 8 Falconer Dr., Mississauga, ON, L5N 1B1. Menu Foods Limited has done business throughout the United States and in the State of New Jersey at all times relevant to this lawsuit.

8. Defendant Menu Foods Inc. is a New Jersey corporation, with its headquarters at 9130 Griffith Mogan Lane, Pennsauken, NJ 08110. Menu Foods Inc. has done business throughout the United States and in the State of New Jersey at all times relevant to this lawsuit. Menu Foods Inc. is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Menu Foods Limited and manufactures pet food for distribution in the United States.

9. Defendant Menu Foods Midwest Corporation is a Delaware corporation, with its headquarters at PO Box 1046, 1400 East Logan Ave., Emporia, KS 66801. Menu Foods Midwest Corporation has done business throughout the United States and in the State of New Jersey at all times relevant to this lawsuit. Menu Foods Midwest Corporation is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Menu Foods Limited and manufactures pet food for distribution in the United States.

10. The events complained of occurred throughout the United States and in the State of New Jersey.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

11. This Court has original jurisdiction over this class action under 28 U.S.C. §1332(d)(2), (d) (5)(B), (d) (6) because (i) there are 100 or more class members, (ii) there is an aggregate amount in controversy of at least \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and (iii) there is minimal diversity because at least one plaintiff and one defendant are citizens of different states.

12. Venue in this Court is proper in that Defendants transacted business in this county and the conduct complained of occurred in this district, as well as elsewhere in New Jersey.

#### **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

13. Defendant Menu Foods Limited purports to be the leading North American private label/contract manufacturer of wet pet food products sold by supermarket retailers, mass merchandisers, pet specialty retailers, and other retail and wholesale outlets. In 2006, Menu Foods Limited produced more than one billion containers of pet food.

14. Defendant Menu Foods Limited is the parent company of, and wholly-owns, both